UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

Morals of the Tribe

By ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

The Plight of the Minorities

By P. M. MATTHÉEFF

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

Part II, Chapter XXII. *By* M. K. GANDHI

The Outlawry of War

An Interview with S. O. Levinson

By CURTIS W. REESE

VOLUME XCVIII NUMBER 24

Chicago, February 14, 1927

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
ZONA GALE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
H. R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE Pamphlet Mission FOR FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER IN RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:
Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Francis L. Rossiter, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
David Starr Jordan
George Saranton
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
CHINA—Gilbert Reid
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lusidi
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoha
RUSSIA—Alina Huebach

UNITY PUBLISHING Co., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

Announcement

Part II

OF GANDHI'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY

began in this magazine on

September 20th

GANDHI'S RETURN TO INDIA
HIS LAW PRACTISE
BEGINNING OF HIS PUBLIC CAREER
and
THE GREAT STORY OF SOUTH AFRICA

Subscribe Now! *Renew Now!*

UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY
700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Sirs: Enclosed please find $3.00, for which
(a) Enter my subscription for one year from date,
or
(b) Renew my subscription for one year from date of expiration.

Name .....

Address .....

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Page

Notes 371
Morals of the Tribe—ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY.. 373
Jottings—J. H. H..... 375

ARTICLES—

The Plight of the Minorities—P. M. MATTHÉEFF 375
The Story of My Experiments with Truth—Part II, Chapter XXII. Comparative Study of Religions—M. K. GANDHI..... 377
The Outlawry of War—An Interview with S. O. Levinson by CURTIS W. REESE..... 378
Reminiscences of Debs—ROSALIE GOODYEAR... 380
Words—GERTRUDE TRAUBEL 382

POETRY—

Ever Onward—MARGUERITE EMILIO..... 371
The World-Man—*Henry Victor Morgan*..... 384

CORRESPONDENCE—

Washington and the Peace Party—EDWIN D. MEAD 382
Mussolini and the Carnegie Endowment—HENRY NEUMANN 383

THE FIELD—

An Open Letter from Roumanian Jews of America 383

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME XCVIII MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1927 NUMBER 24

EVER ONWARD
(A Hymn)

Eternal Spirit, God of all,
We thank thee for the faith we hold,
A faith made free by daring souls,
By prophets, martyrs, men of old.

Back in the dim and misty past,
Men worshipped thee by trees and rocks,
And to the sacrificial fire
They gave the first-born of their flocks.

As ages passed their thought advanced,
Led by the few who glimpsed new light,
Whose finer faith and flaming zeal
Banished the rites of ancient night.

May we, who now uphold the torch
Of truth and faith in this our age,
Go ever onward, fear no change,
Be worthy of our heritage.

MARGUERITE EMILIO.

For UNITY.

If the Coolidge administration survives this Mexican affair, it will be the greatest miracle in the career of the immortal Calvin, and that is saying a good deal! From the beginning, the President and his precious Secretary of State have been outplayed, outmaneuvered, beaten. The very fact that America holds all the cards, as Mr. Coolidge so strenuously insists, only makes the record a thousand times worse. In every exchange of notes, in every matching of argument with argument and fact with fact, the Mexican President has taken the trick. If this diplomatic game were a poker game, Calles would have all the chips on the table, and Coolidge would be putting up his watch, Elks' pin, and shirt studs. We are no adept in American diplomatic history, but we venture the suggestion that never in all our career as a nation has the Department of State been so consistently outwitted and humiliated as in recent months in Mexico. Nor has the actual advantage won and lost been the most impressive part of the episode! More notable still is the consistently higher ground taken, nobler spirit shown, by the Mexican authorities—Kellogg has been blustering, insulting, impudent, while Calles has been unfailingly courteous and soft-spoken. Kellogg has threatened, but Calles has always appealed to reason and goodwill. President Coolidge has flouted arbitration, President Calles appealed to arbitration, as the one decent, fair and civilized method of settling disputes between nations. In other words, our country, in the hands of Coolidge and Kellogg, has not only been beaten in negotiation, but has been cast down before its knightly rival in the gutter of vulgarism and brutality. European nations see the truth; we are the butt of all their ridicule and scorn! The Latin-American countries understand; we are feared and hated from the Panama Canal to Cape Horn! Only our own citizens are not yet wide awake to the degree of betrayal at Washington of which they are today the victims. But they are waking, be sure of that! It was public protest that stopped the war-policy of Kellogg a month ago, and it is public knowledge, we must believe, which will sooner or later teach the people to repudiate Coolidge and all his works. If not, then is the ex-Massachusetts Governor in very truth the one great miracle-worker of all time.

We are opposed to the "wets"—but would have no feeling against them if they were only honest. It is their abominable hypocrisy that stirs our ire. Talk about the hypocrisy of the "drys"—it is nothing as compared with the sham and shoddy of the liquor men! Take the raucous hullaballoo at Christmas time over poisoned whiskey, for example! Was the government doing something it had never done before? Not a thing! Was anything happening that had never happened before? Not a thing! We had exactly the same situation that we had had for years—yea, for centuries—of men wantonly drinking themselves to death with bad liquor—such liquor being relatively more common at the present moment owing to successful Prohibition restrictions, that's all. Yet the long-suffering welkin was made to ring with the outcry that the government was deliberately poisoning alcohol to the end of making drinking a capital offense. Now comes another furious sensation—the discovery that the government is employing so-called "under cover" methods in the fight against smugglers and bootleggers. For methods of this kind, let us say emphatically, we have no use of any kind. We think it frankly disgusting for the government to use deceit and chicanery, and itself covertly participate in crime, for the sake of detecting and punishing crime. But why make all this trouble now because such methods are being used by the national Prohibition forces in the fight against the illicit liquor traffic? The government is only doing what it has always done in matters of this kind. The "under-

cover" agent, the "stool-pigeon," has always been on the Washington pay-roll. Why, he was sent out in droves, during the days of the "red" scare, to join trades unions, worm his way into Socialist and Communist locals, even perpetrate crimes of violence, for the sake of trapping the so-called Bolshevists. Why didn't the newspapers and the "wets" generally raise an outcry against *this* abomination? Why have they not long since driven the government out of this nefarious business? Because they don't object to "under cover" men when they are kept in their place—betraying radicals, for example! They simply object to their being used against themselves for Prohibition enforcement. The "wets," in other words, are flatly dishonest. Let them face Prohibition squarely, on its merits, if they would be respected!

The failure of the jury to convict in the famous Daugherty trial in New York, followed by the acquittal of Fall and Doheny in Washington and of Pastor Norris in Texas, raises anew the question as to whether our jury system is that perfect instrument of justice which it has for so long been described to be. Something is obviously wrong when things of this kind can happen. Yet we doubt if it is the jury system in itself which is breaking down. The jury operates in England exactly as it does in this country, but results are so different as to be unrecognizable. In England convictions are still possible—would have been inevitable in cases as carefully prepared and as ably presented as those of Daugherty and Doheny. No, the trouble in America is not with our jury, but with our whole attitude toward the problem of administering justice. Take such a matter as our selection of jurors. In England, even in the most important cases, twelve good men and true are found within a comparatively few moments. In this country, hours and sometimes many days are spent in finding men whose one qualification must be that they have never read anything about the case in question, or, better still, have never even heard of it. With the result that, in cases involving complicated facts and frequently technical information, twelve jurors are selected whose interest in and knowledge of public affairs never passes beyond the sports page or the comic strip! Then again, our whole method of trying a case—the rules of evidence, the objections and interruptions, the delays and technicalities! Before a day has gone by, the illiterate juror is hopelessly confused, and before the end of the interminable trial as hopelessly bored, and nonchalantly gives the benefit of the doubt to the defendant, and hurries to get home. Then, as the final and worst abuse of all, is the turning of the whole business of justice into a "show" for the amusement of the public. Reporters, photographers, "movie" men swarm about the court, and everything is done primarily to suit *their* convenience. From the judge down, the whole procedure seems to be a struggle to win the first page of the latest tabloid. What wonder that jurors go wrong under conditions of this kind? The old system is as good as it ever was, but we are abusing it horribly.

The law should be on the moral side of every public question. This dictum, laid down by a friend of ours, is as good an answer to the enigma of law and morals as we have ever seen. Of course, there are many these days who dispense with morality altogether, and who therefore argue that there is no moral side to any question. Life is all a matter of what you want to do, not of what you ought to do. In the bright lexicon of modern youth, there is no such word as "ought"! But we are old-fashioned enough to believe in the moral law; and, what is more, we are simple enough to believe that the bearing of this moral law upon any particular question at any time is not difficult to discover. There is a moral side to every question, in other words, and the statute law of the state should always be on that side. First comes conscience, and then law as the register of conscience! This surely is what has happened in the past, isn't it—as in the case of chattel slavery, for example? There came a time when certain men discovered and proclaimed that slavery was wrong. These men, the Abolitionists, persuaded public opinion over a large area that they were right in this judgment. Then came the demand that the law of the nation, which had to be on the side either of the defenders or the enemies of slavery, should be put on the side of those who saw it to be wrong. And it was done. Conscience was translated into a Constitutional amendment. It is this same principle which lies back of the Prohibition amendment. The liquor traffic is an evil—every intelligent man knows this, whatever his opinion about his own individual right to drink. Now the law, as the expression of the community's will and power, must either be for the liquor traffic or against it. And the Prohibitionists insist, and insist rightly, that in this dilemma the law be on the side of morals. The same principle holds again in the problem of war, as the Outlawry people have discovered. Up to the present moment the law of nations has been, as it is now, a law of war, in support of war, on the side of war. Why should not this law of nations be a law against war, in denunciation of war, in outlawry of war? Why should not the pacifists, in other words, who are seeking peace, rather than the militarists who are condoning war, have the weight and authority and power of the law of nations on *their* side? The militarists have had the advantage long enough. *The law should be on the moral side of every public question.*

Installment buying is getting discussion to match its wide recent spread. It is thought to be good busi-

ness. But in our opinion it is questionable business. This is not the first time that "good" business has been questionable. It increases the volume of sales. The losses do not fall upon the merchant, but upon other purchasers and the public. The merchant sees to that. He sets his prices to allow for all possible losses from defaulted payments and returned goods,—and then some! For all except the hardened commercialist, the ethical and social effects of the mode are of large if not primary concern. On this phase of the question the returns are not all in. It makes buyers adventurous, and some of them reckless. Too adventurous? How many are confirmed in recklessness? How many learn new caution after the first few flings, and so benefit by the experience? Does it add to social efficiency to enable the buyer to use his tools while he is paying for them? Our commercial and industrial system has generally answered this question in the affirmative, for credit is the basis of most transactions in these fields. Is it as reasonable to extend the same opportunities to the individual in the ordering of his domestic and personal program? If the young man is set up in business on credit, why should not his wife be set up in her business of home-making on the same basis? If such reasoning is accepted the whole teaching of thrift will have to be recast. Indeed, defenders of installment buying are latterly vocal in their claims that the system cultivates thrift. It is a way to save, a highly effective way. Save or go bankrupt, is its demand. If the system succeeds in cultivating an American character which shall be both adventurous and thrifty we may next tackle squaring the circle. The method is expensive,—for the buyer. He pays on the average once and half for his goods. Do the advantages compensate him? The profits go to the promotor. Is this a new turn of the screw which makes the rich richer and the poor poorer? We can better judge the system after these questions are answered.

It's amazing—what writers are doing these days with Jesus! It is only a little while ago that Papini filled the world with his sentimental ravings over Jesus the Christ, the divine Son of God, the miracle-worker —all the traditional material worked over into a nauseating mess of superstitious adulation. Then came Bruce Barton with his presentation of the Nazarene as a first-class publicity man, using the most approved arts and methods of twentieth century advertising to advance his reforms. Works of serious interest and genuine merit have been published by Rollin Lynde Hartt, who sees in Jesus a passionate and powerful Jew deluded by the Messianic myth, and by Mary Austin, who presents the Master as "a small-town man" dowered with mystic genius of a rarely exalted type. Now comes Georg Brandes, in the fullness of his old age, to tell us in his recent book that Jesus never lived! There is nothing particularly new in this idea, nor in Brandes's presentation of it, but it is a bit startling to find a man of such pre-eminent intellectual standing lending to this concept the authority of his name. In reading these books, no uninformed reader would ever imagine that they one and all deal with the same personage, and one and all derive their material from the same sources. Yet these recent books, and the multitudinous others which have preceded them, every one spring from the four Gospels. All of which goes to show—first, how meagre is our data for any sure knowledge of the founder of Christianity; secondly, how little we really know, or even seem to know, about this man; and lastly, how disproportionate is the great mass of myth and legend that hides the modicum of possible truth! Of one thing only are we certain, and that is, that whether we know this or that about Jesus, whether indeed he ever lived or not, there is at the heart of his story the most precious spiritual deposit of all time. The Sermon on the Mount, the Good Samaritan, Gethsemane, Calvary, these endure.

Morals of the Tribe

We talk of Western civilization. Western people call themselves civilized. We even at times call ourselves a Christian nation. Some people go so far as to think that we owe it to ourselves and to the world to state plainly that Christ is our King by inserting the statement to this effect in the constitution. For more than a century we have been sending missionaries to the so-called heathen and we have organized great societies to do this work. We spend millions of dollars on the theory that we have a religion to export. Preachers and politicians vie with one another in finding phrases to express the essential Christianity of our people.

But it only requires a cursory survey of our social and industrial life to reveal the fact that there are many things about it that are rather incompatible with Christianity or any other religion which contains in it an element of ethical idealism.

The thing which surprises the careful observer the most is the persistence, in our day, of tribal forms, tribal institutions and of tribal spirit. The tribe is probably the most complete and perfect working social organization that man ever achieved. When students of anthropology first began to study the development of social institutions of the past, they found many tribes in different stages of development. Truly primitive people, of course, have long since disappeared from the earth. No tribe with which we have come in contact was without a long cultural history. Many tribes, when first studied, were on the verge of stepping from barbarism into the order of civilization. And some,—as those in Australia and Tasmania,—represented a

very low order of development. But with all these differences there are certain common elements always found in tribal life. One of these is the universal recognition that the "mores" of the tribe are limited. There was one rule of life for the members of the tribe in relation to one another, but this did not apply to the "stranger." It is true there were exceptional cases where the "stranger," by making appeal to the sympathies of individual members of the tribe, received kindly and thoughtful consideration. This was especially true when the stranger was not looked upon as a potential enemy.

But after all, the members of the tribe were united in a closely knitted social order for mutual protection. The customs and traditions had to do not only with earthly affairs but also with the gods of the tribes who were recognized as being essential to the common welfare. He who violated one of these customs was an enemy of the people. He was a traitor to the group. His punishment was severe. To neglect the tribal god was high treason. To obey these tribal rules was to be a good citizen. The one who violated them was a bad citizen. So it came about that in relation to the members of the tribe, honesty, generosity, sacrifice, devotion to the common good, obedience to the rules concerning sexual relations was the common rule of life. But when it came to the relations with another tribe all these virtues became evils. He who would not steal from a member of the tribe may, and under some circumstances ought to, steal from a "stranger." Murder in the tribe seldom occurred, and only in a fit of rage when the individual, intoxicated by his passion, became oblivious of his social duty. But it was a totally different thing to murder without the tribe. That might even be a religious duty. In short, within the tribe men felt the sense of responsibility for each other but this responsibility seldom extended beyond the tribal limitation.

When we come to examine our civilization closely, we are surprised at how widely these tribal customs and tribal ideals still prevail. We have the tribal loyalty persisting in many of the professions. Members of these professions feel that they have certain duties and responsibilities to each other which do not exist between them and the people generally. There is a tendency to protect the members of the profession. They give to one another certain advantages. Every one knows how difficult it is for a member of the bar to bring proceedings against his fellow-member for disbarment. It may be generally known among the members of the profession that a member has violated not only the code of ethics but also the law of the state, but no action is taken unless a public scandal arises. We have fraternal orders in which the tribal virtues are cultivated and, whether it is true or not, there is a feeling that in many of these orders there is a strong tendency to protect the individual even against the authority of the law of the state. This same tribal feeling is found in the religious sects. The members of a church feel that they must protect if possible an erring member. The public welfare is forgotten in a desire to protect the reputation of the organization. Frequently attorneys for the state reject prospective jury men on no other ground than that they belong to the same religious denomination as the defendant. Tribal feeling in churches often is exhibited in the form of rivalries which involve no other end than the increase of the church tribe.

Another form in which this tribal feeling manifests itself is in the attitude different classes of society have for one another. The so-called aristocratic classes in many cases openly insist that there is one rule of conduct for them and another for the lower classes. A punishment that does not seem too severe in the case of the humble working man seems beyond reason when applied to a member of a family of wealth and high social standing. Even the rule of chastity is one thing within a social class and another thing in relations between upper class and the so-called lower classes.

Then within society we have the persistence of the double standard. Just as there was one rule for action within the tribe and another rule for action between members of different tribes, so we have in society two standards of conduct. For instance a man may be a good father and a good neighbor, and in all his personal relations a gentleman. But the same individual when he comes to deal with the state acts very much as the tribe does when it deals with members of other tribes. The man that will not steal a penny from a friend will take from the state millions of dollars and because none of his "mores" are violated he is in no way disturbed in his conscience. This is illustrated in the fact that people of rigid honesty in their personal dealings defraud a car company, a gas company, or other public service institution without the slightest remorse. In this respect they reveal themselves to be essentially tribal men.

This is even better illustrated in the relations of individuals to members of other nations and other races. Highly honored and perfectly respectable people, pillars of society and good churchmen, have been known to loan vast sums of money to the rulers of undeveloped peoples knowing that the money so lent was going to be spent in riotous and licentious living. In fact there have been cases where such rulers have been urged to borrow money for such purposes. Within their own countries such action would have utterly discredited them professionally if not morally, but they did not lose standing in church or society because their dealings were with an undeveloped people. When it comes to actual warfare every immorality within the state becomes morality in dealing with the enemy. Then the tribal life manifests itself most clearly. In

war men can lie, cheat, kill, starve to death women and children, without the slightest compunction of conscience.

If anything about Christianity is clear, it is that its ethics is universal in application. The essential spirit of Christianity was arrayed against the spirit of tribal life. The Kingdom of God on earth knows no limitations of class or race. The fatherhood of God implies a brotherhood of men. But so long as these tribal customs persist we cannot claim to be a Christian people. If the great war revealed anything at all, it made clear that we are worshipping national gods whose protection we seek over against the gods of other nations. And this is "tribalism." There may be certain excellencies in it and some beauty, but certainly it is far from the Christian ideal. It is absurd to call it Christianity. The sooner we face this fact the more hope there will be that we will make progress in the realization of the Christian ideal of the Brotherhood of man. ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY.

Jottings

Professor Hayes, of Columbia, waxes eloquent in derision of the patriotic custom of kissing the Liberty Bell. We agree with him—kissing the Liberty Bell is as silly as kissing the flag. But Professor Hayes is a good Catholic! What has he got to say about kissing the cardinal's ring?

When we were a student at Harvard the regular annual chess victories over Yale used to bring us compensation for the as regular football defeats. We feel something of the same thrill today as we read the charges of the great Dr. Lasker, and thus discover a chess scandal to match up with the football and baseball scandals. Chess is a major sport again!

We like definitions, and here is one of the best we ever saw. It is from Lewis Browne's "This Believing World":

> "Theology very frequently is no more than an effort to prolong the life of moribund ideas by reinterpreting words which no longer mean what they used to say."

Human nature is pretty much the same everywhere. In that magazine of scorn, aimed at the great American "boob," the *American Mercury,* we find these advertisements—(1) "Learn to speak French by this easy European method," (2) "Every Short Story Maupassant Ever Wrote, French Life and Love, unabridged," (3) "Free, This Interesting Booklet, 'How Dr. Johnson Would Marvel,' " (4) " 'You didn't say a single word all evening'—How Wives keep pace with Successful Husbands—Elbert Hubbard Scrap Book Now Published," etc. Just like the tabloids, after all!

An explorer in California has found a cavern in a desert, on the walls of which is a fresco containing warlike figures, all seven to nine feet tall. "From this," says the newspaper account, "he believes the ancient cave city was inhabited by a race of giants." Five thousand years hence, when America has become a waste, we can imagine an explorer entering New York harbor, and discovering the toppled ruin of the Statue of Liberty. From this, we imagine, he would infer that the lost race of Americans, especially the women, were of enormous size.

We are not surprised that President Coolidge is unwilling to meet President Calles on the Rio Grande, and settle differences between the United States and Mexico. A high-school boy, called upon to play Tilden for a tennis championship, would be equally unwilling.

J. H. H.

The Plight of the Minorities

[From our Bulgarian Correspondent]

It is difficult if not impossible for American readers to understand the condition of things in the Balkan countries, the pretensions to territory and nationality, past and present, which divide the peoples in them. The more any one of them obtains, the greater is its pretension to further acquisitions. As most of these pretensions are unfounded, the means employed in support of them are most dishonest and unscrupulous: geography is distorted, history is falsified, what was patent and acknowledged yesterday as true is wrong and a lie today.

The unexpected greatness to which the peace treaties raised Yugoslavia, Greece and Roumania has developed in them instincts of the worst type in this respect. Subjects to Turkey until recently, they have failed to cleanse their spirit of the degrading elements impressed upon them by the many centuries of subjection to a cruel alien race, which ruled over them by fomenting division among them.

My object is to present the methods these Balkan countries, now united into the Little Entente, employ to carry out the program virtually laid upon them by the authors of the Peace Treaties, as they wish to understand it, *and as they are encouraged to carry it out.* These countries, Czechoslovakia included, have been granted territories beyond their dreams, and necessarily include nationalities (minorities) alien to them in race and religion. Their program is to consolidate these territories, and the peoples in them, into one country and one nation, to assimilate them by every means to the people of the master ruler.

The provisions in the peace treaties for the protection of these minorities are to be considered as a worthless sop to the humane sentiments of the world.

At the 37th regular session of the League of Nations, 7-16, December, 1925, a discussion arose as to the rights of minorities to the protection of the instrument provided by the peace treaties. The Brazilian delegate, Mr. Mello-Franco, gave a peculiar interpretation of these rights—that the special provisions for the protection of the minorities could not aim at the perpetuation of the existence of such minorities, that they simply guaranteed to them tolerable personal conditions of life which must, however, lead to assimilation with the ruling nation. Such an interpretation from a South American delegate may pass without comment, but it actually received the sanction of other more important delegates, one of whom was Sir Austen Chamberlain, the others, Mr. Benes, Czechoslovakian Minister of Foreign affairs, and Mr. Hymans, Belgian delegate. Please to note—no objection was uttered to this interpretation by any one present!

The only spark of humanity registered in the peace treaties, as to the future relations of the conquerors towards the conquered, was thus derided without the least compunction.

The result is a free hand to deal with such minorities. The sooner they are blotted out of existence the sooner will all possibility of interference, on their behalf, disappear. And the race to destroy, to assimilate, such minorities in Yugoslav, Roumanian and Greek territories continues persistent, systematic, and without relaxation. They are beaten and imprisoned whenever they dare to pronounce their national name, their own for twelve centuries; their national family names are travestied to resemble those of their tyrants; they have to learn to talk and pray in the language of their oppressors.

The Powers-that-be are aware that these minorities cannot, dare not, complain; and as no direct complaints from such minorities have reached the League of Nations, this body declines to take direct official notice of the sufferings resulting from the callous and intentional disregard of formal provisions in the peace treaties.

Ungovernable oppression, robbery, murder, wholesale and in the best approved shape, are the means regularly resorted to in Yugoslavia, Roumania and Greece in order to blot out the minorities which the peace treaties have confided to them for safe keeping, as regards their language, religion and national feeling.

Thousands have been driven to flee with their bare lives into Bulgaria; thousands have undergone imprisonment and been rendered destitute because they have attempted to invoke the peace treaties in self-protection: hundreds have been shot down in batches as worthless dogs. All these atrocities committed in broad day have been brought to the knowledge of the League of Nations, as also to that of the nations in whose hands this League is a willing instrument.

No one, however, has been brought to account for these abominations. On the contrary, the miscreant agents responsible for them have been promoted and proclaimed patriots of exceptional value by their respective countrymen. Why not? These men have acted as the perspicacious instruments of those great wise, unselfish men sitting in Geneva as delegates to the League of Nations and spokesmen for the League—Sir Austen Chamberlain, Mr. Benes, Mr. Mello-Franco, Mr. Hymans.

The peace treaties provide full constitutional rights for all the peoples included in the territories arbitrarily annexed to the states here concerned: equality before the law, freedom to exercise their religion and to use their national language, freedom for national associations and national development, so long as such freedom does not conflict *with public order and good morals.*

This protection granted to the minorities was no doubt a concession to President Wilson's demand for justice to all, a mere shadow of what he proclaimed to the world when crossing the ocean. This grant is clear and definite, a spark of humanity in the midst of distorted passions in which the peace treaties were dictated. The above mentioned statesmen to favor the sordid, unnatural interests of petty protégés, have, eight years after the war, extinguished even this small spark of humanity, and have proclaimed it an hypocrisy by the interpretation they have given, as stated above, to the clauses in the treaties which guaranteed humane protection to the minorities in question.

These minorities have been and continue to be subjected to the most ruthless and savage uncontrolled misrule as were the natives of the Belgian Congo under the royal Leopold's reign. Have they to wait for the rise of another Morel?

I reported at the time in these columns the grewsome massacre of 29 Bulgarian peasants of the village of Garvan, Macedonia. They were led a couple of miles out of the village, hands tied behind back, by soldiers under the command of a Yugoslav officer, shot down and left to be devoured by the dogs and wolves, because they *disobeyed the order* to admit that they had knowledge of the presence of political disturbers of the peace.

I reported at the time, in these same columns also, the massacre of 26 Bulgarian peasants of the village of Tarliss, Macedonia, when under a military escort under the command of a Greek officer. These were shot down as those of Garvan had been, and for the same reason and purpose. In this case a special enquiry was ordered by the League of Nations and the most revolting barbarity was established against the Greek authorities. The official report to the League is a volume of 160 pages, quarto.

Nobody was punished.

And now we have the massacre of 45 Bulgarian peasants in the Dobroudja by the Roumanian authorities, carried out in exactly the same manner as those of Garvan and Tarliss, for the same reason and purpose.

In each case the local press of the responsible countries, and the foreign ones as well, were flooded with information accusing Bulgaria of sending armed bands across the frontier to foment trouble in her neighbors' territories! It is unbelievable, but a fact, that the Roumanians actually arranged and had a requiem service celebrated for the Roumanian victims of Bulgarian ferocities. Atrocious irony! The attendance of the Bulgarians at this requiem was *requested.*

Disarmed Bulgaria is living under the constant menace of her neighbours armed to the teeth, all in common agreement to keep her down-trodden. She dare not even think of provoking them.

American readers must wonder on reading what is here stated. Many will think of exaggeration if not invention. I do wish it were so. Unhappily there is truth, hard truth, in every word.

And where will such a situation of things lead to?

P. M. MATTHÉEFF.

Sofia, Bulgaria.

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

[The Autobiography of Mahatma Gandhi]

(Copyrighted, 1927)

PART II—CHAPTER XXII

Comparative Study of Religions

If I found myself entirely absorbed in the service of the community, the reason behind it was my desire for self-realization. I had made the religion of service my own as I felt that God could be realized only through service. And service, for me, was the service of India, because it came to me without my seeking, because I had an aptitude for it. I had gone to South Africa for travel, for finding an escape from Kathiawar intrigues and for gaining my own livelihood. But, as I have said, I found myself in search of God and striving for self-realization.

Christian friends had whetted my appetite for knowledge which had become almost insatiable, and they would not leave me in peace, even if I desired to be indifferent. In Durban Mr. Spencer Walton, the head of the South Africa General Mission, found me out. I became almost a member of his family. At the back of this acquaintance, was of course my contact with Christians in Pretoria. Mr. Walton had a manner all his own. I do not recollect his ever having invited me to embrace Christianity. But he placed his life as an open book before me and let me watch all his movements. Mrs. Walton was a very gentle and talented woman. I liked the attitude of this couple. We knew the fundamental difference between us. Any amount of discussion could not efface them. Yet even differences prove helpful where there is tolerance, charity and truth. I liked Mr. and Mrs. Walton's humility, perseverance and devotion to work, and we met very frequently.

This friendship kept alive my interest in religion. It was impossible now to get the leisure that I used to have in Pretoria for my religious studies. But what little time I could spare I turned to good account. My religious correspondence continued. Rayachandbhai was guiding me. Some friend sent me Narmadashanker's book "Dharma Vichar." Its preface proved very helpful. I had heard about the Bohemian way in which the poet had lived, and a description, in the preface, of the revolution effected in his life by his religious studies captivated me. I came to like the book and read it from cover to cover with attention. I read with interest Max Muller's book, "India—What can it teach us?" and the translation of the "Upanishades" published by the Theosophical Society. All this enhanced my regard for Hinduism and its beauties began to grow upon me. This, however did not prejudice me against other religions. I read Washington Irving's "Mahomed and His Followers" and Carlyle's panegyric on the Prophet. These books raised Mahomed in my estimate. I also read a book called the "Sayings of Zarathustra."

Thus I gained more knowledge of the different religions. The study stimulated my self-introspection and fostered in me the habit of putting into practice whatever appealed to me in my studies. Thus I began some of the Yogic practices, as well as I could understand them from a reading of the Hindu books. But I could not get on very far and decided to follow them with the help of some expert when I returned to India. The desire has never been fulfilled.

I made too an intensive study of Tolstoy's books. "The Gospels in Brief," "What to Do?" and other books made a deep impression on me. I began to realize more and more the infinite possibilities of universal love.

About the same time I came in contact with another Christian family. At their suggestion, I attended the Wesleyan church every Sunday. For these days I also had their standing invitation to dinner. The church did not make a favorable impression on me. The sermons seemed to be uninspiring. The congregation did not strike me as being particularly religious. They were not an assembly of devout souls, they appeared rather to be worldly-minded people going to church for recreation and in conformity to custom. Here, at times, I would involuntarily doze. I was ashamed, but some of my neighbors who were in no better case lightened the shame. I could not go on long like this and soon gave up attending the service.

My connection with the family I used to visit every Sunday was abruptly broken. In fact it may be said that I was warned to visit it no more. It happened thus. My hostess was a good and simple woman but somewhat narrow-minded. We always discussed religious matters. I was then re-reading Arnold's "Light of Asia." Once we began to compare the life of Jesus with that of Buddha. "Look at Gautama's compassion!" said I, "It was not confined to mankind, it was extended to all living beings. Does not one's heart overflow with love to think of the lamb joyously perched on his shoulders? One fails to notice this love for all living beings in the life of Jesus." The comparison pained the good lady. I could understand her feelings. I cut the matter short and we went to the dining room. Her son, a cherub aged scarcely five, was also with us. I am happiest when in the midst of children and this youngster and I had long been friends. I spoke derisively of the piece of meat in his plate and in high praise of the apple in mine. The innocent boy was carried away and joined in my praise of the fruit.

But the mother? She was dismayed.

I was warned. I checked myself and changed the subject. The following week I visited the family as usual but not without trepidation. I did not see that I should stop going there, I did not think it proper either. But the good lady made my way easy.

"Mr. Gandhi," she said, "please don't take it ill if I feel obliged to tell you that my boy is none the better for your company. Every day he hesitates to eat meat and asks for fruit, reminding me of your argument. This is too much. If he gives up meat he is bound to get weak, if not ill. How could I bear it? Your discussions should henceforth be only with us elders. They are sure to react badly on children."

"Mrs. . . .," I replied, "I am sorry. I can understand your feelings as a parent, for I, too, have children. We can very easily end this unpleasant state of things. What I eat and omit to eat is bound to have a greater effect on the child than what I say. The best way, therefore, is for me to stop these visits. That certainly need not affect our friendship."

"I thank you," she said with evident relief.

M. K. GANDHI.

(*Translated from Navajivan by Mahadeo Desai*)

The Outlawry of War

An Interview with S. O. Levinson by Curtis W. Reese

Great ideas do not appear very often but when they do the structure of society is shaken from top to bottom. Such an idea is that of the Outlawry of War. The father of the idea is Mr. S. O. Levinson of Chicago, whose interest in peace was stimulated by the risk of two sons in the late war. Mr. Levinson is a Jew in whose soul burn prophetic fires; a lawyer in whose mind justice is regarded as workable; an organization expert in whose hands business concerns find practical solutions. He believes that *what should be can be.*

The idea of Outlawry as outlined by Mr. Levinson early found additional champions in the persons of Senators Knox and Borah and the philosopher John Dewey. Other men of note (far too many to credit here) have joined Mr. Levinson and his early colleagues until now it is not too much to say that Outlawry has become a gospel with an increasing body of literature and competent exponents.

So dramatic and dynamic is the idea of Outlawry that the very term itself is constantly used by peace schemes that do not in fact embody outlawry as the term is properly used.

The following are the three essentials:

(1) The Outlawry of War by means of an international treaty agreement.

(2) The codification of international law on the basis of the illegality of war, as a method of settling disputes or enforcing court decisions, and the equality of all nations before the law.

(3) The establishment of a world supreme court possessing affirmative jurisdiction,—meaning thereby the power to summon in the offending nation upon petition of a complaining nation, and to decide the dispute on the merits of the case. This distinguishes the court from arbitration tribunals, including the world court, which have no such power.

It is to be noticed that the plan condemns and abandons the sanctions of force; and while it reprobates efforts to distinguish between permissible and non-permissible kinds of war, it does not affect the question of a genuine self-defense against invasion. Also, while it "invades" it does not impair sovereignty; it merely asks the nations to "renounce the sovereign right to do wrong."

The advocates of Outlawry believe that these principles are so basic that they must not be compromised. Hence they judge all other peace programs in the light of these principles. If a peace program is compatible with Outlawry it is acceptable. If it is not compatible with Outlawry it must be either overhauled or definitely rejected.

Believing as I do that the unification of peace movements is necessary for effective action and that certain existing international situations are facts accomplished and not readily done away with, I became curious to know how, if at all, certain existing peace programs could be woven into Outlawry without compromising it and at the same time give the other plans the "spiritual lift" of a moral idea, which they sorely need.

Hence I went straight to the Chicago office of Mr. Levinson and plied him with questions on Outlawry and related matters.

First I asked Mr. Levinson if in his opinion the League of Nations should initiate the Outlawry treaty; or would it be better for a nation not in the League to initiate it; or should the United States propose to enter the League on an Outlawry basis. To this Mr. Levinson replied that the United States is in the best position to initiate Outlawry. The United States needs Outlawry less than does any of the other countries, and hence can make a fair, clear, and effective pronouncement without being open to the charge of ulterior motives. He said that should the other countries respond negatively to such a proposal on the part of the United States, then the United States should refuse utterly to have anything whatever to do with any international scheme *until the nations agree to abolish war.* At this point Mr. Levinson said that before the interview was over he would have something to say about the League of Nations.

My next question was, What classes of disputes would be involved in the scheme to outlaw war? From the reply I learned that three classes of disputes are contemplated:

(1) Disputes that are by common agreement or by code classed as purely international.

(2) Construction and interpretation of all treaties.

(3) Disputes that may arise that are not enumerated in the code or covered by treaties. These disputes may be domestic in character, may involve the national way of life for nations. Outlawry here insists that all nations agree that they will not settle these disputes by war. This gives a watertight agreement covering every conceivable dispute.

Mr. Levinson added: The essence of the foregoing is that while nations may not be willing to submit for adjudication all disputes arising from domestic and protective questions, such as immigration, tariff, prohibition and many others, the agreement is absolute that such disputes, if they arise, shall not be settled by war. Better a million times that they go unsettled than that civilization be torn asunder in the war process. The agreement not to go to war will apply to every nation. As Prof. Gilbert Murray has recently and splendidly said: "In course of time, if war is forbidden, a settlement will be found." In other words, if war is ruled out, conciliation and adjustment will be facilitated.

Here Mr. Levinson illustrated the point by reference to the ninety cases of controversy between the sovereign states of the American Union which have been settled on the basis of supreme court decisions without the shedding of a drop of blood.

I then asked what step would follow the adoption by the nation of an Outlawry resolution. The reply was that the next logical step would be a World Conference to draft the outlawry treaty, which treaty should be brief and should cover all the above named classes of disputes. This Conference would take the

position that war is henceforth to be regarded as illegal and a crime against civilization. This World Conference must have a real "open door." The press should have free play and thereby would be constituted a figurative international radio whereby the whole world would be listening in and could be depended upon to make effective the moral will against the war system.

I then asked, Is there any existing body that could codify international law on the basis of the illegality of war or would a special assembly be necessary? The reply was that following the adoption of the outlawry treaty by the peoples of the several nations there should be called another special Conference for codification of international law. This work would probably require five years. In the meantime a temporary treaty (technically called a *modus vivendi*) could be adopted until the new code was completed and ratified by the peoples of the nations. Mr. Levinson called attention to the recent formulation of a Pan-American code which is the first effort made for the codification of the laws of peace as distinguished from the laws of war. This code should be studied by every student of world peace as a pro tanto model for a world code.

My next question was, Does existing international law lend itself to revision on the basis of Outlawry or would virtually a new code be necessary? The vast bulk of existing international law, I was told, applies to war conditions and rules and regulations of war, contraband, neutrality, etc., and only a small fraction to peace conditions. The great volume, therefore, of present international law would be abandoned or left in abeyance for possible application in the event of an international revolution—an almost inconceivable thing. The future body of international law would consist of the laws of peace based upon principles of equity and justice between all nations a large part of which could be taken from the equity codes already developed in civilized countries. Every civilized nation must be represented in the creation of this code.

Speaking of revolutions reminded me to ask what would be the status of revolution under Outlawry. The reply was that at present the only wars that are illegal are wars of liberation, otherwise called revolutionary wars. These internal revolutionary wars are fought in exactly the same way as international wars, the only difference being that international wars are legal and revolutionary wars are criminal. Therefore, a revolution under Outlawry could refer only to an international revolution; that is to say, some nation running amuck and starting an "old fashioned" war. This seems inconceivable after the Outlawry structure has been erected and the peoples in each civilized country have ratified and committed themselves to the new laws of peace. But the naked right of revolution cannot be taken away by any machinery or any pronouncements, national or international. Put in another way: This conjectural possibility of revolution under Outlawry would only mean that nations, singly or in combination, could break the new laws of peace, make pirates of themselves—a thing that they can now do with perfect legality and authority. Piracy would be successful if enough millions of people would back it but their participation cannot be procured because of the illegality and criminality of the act. Piracy is disreputable, illegal, criminal, and international war should have the same legal status.

I inquired how the existing world court could be revamped to conform to Outlawry. The reply was that the agreement of the nations to abide by and carry out the decisions of the court is all that would be necessary.

By what means, I asked, would Outlawry enforce the decrees of the world supreme court? The reply was:

(1) Good faith on the part of the nations.

(2) Enlightened public opinion functioning under conditions of utmost publicity.

(3) The overwhelming public sentiment against war. We now trust the nations to fulfil their treaty agreements, even their military alliances, the most powerful form of "sanctions." If we can trust nations to obey treaty agreements that oblige them to go to war, surely we can trust them to fulfil a treaty agreement that obliges them not to go to war. If their word is not good to keep the peace, how can their word be relied upon to go to war?

I then asked, What is the difference between Outlawry and a general arbitration treaty? From Mr. Levinson's answer I learned that the difference is something like this:

(1) Arbitration lives in the same house with war.

(2) Outlawry provides a juridical method of compelling the adjudication of international disputes while arbitration furnishes a tribunal that is powerless to take action except upon the consent of both disputants.

(3) Outlawry is a fundamental psychological change in regard to the whole question of war and peace, arbitration is a makeshift alternative arrangement within the war system.

What of disarmament? I asked. The reply was that disarmament would follow Outlawry, but so long as war is legal the disarmament program is utterly impossible. Even if there were no arms the nations would produce them if and when needed, unless there were some basic change in our whole attitude towards war. But with war outlawed by the civilized peoples of the world, governments would have a difficult time securing appropriations with which to build up armies and navies, and a still more difficult time in conscripting soldiers to commit an international crime. Outlawry logically precedes disarmament.

I then asked whether the world could be organized more effectively on the basis of continental units than on the basis of national units. Mr. Levinson replied that it was no great concern on what basis the world is organized or whether it is organized at all *unless we can first get rid of the institution of war.*

This reminded Mr. Levinson that he had agreed to have something to say of his attitude towards the League of Nations. He said that he was among those who were first interested in the League of Nations, but that he was interested in it *as a plan to do away with war* not as a gigantic red cross organization or as a military alliance for the enforcement of the Treaty of Versailles. He said that his objection to the League of Nations was two-fold:

(1) It is an aggregation of force not to outlaw war but to outlaw nations that do not abide by the decisions of an oligarchical council. The assembly of the League of Nations is merely a window display or a dress parade.

(2) The real force is in the hands of the council, which is composed of the representatives of the powerful nations and a few others. This, Mr. Levinson insisted, is neither right nor workable. That it is not right is self-evident from a democratic point of view; that it is not workable is evident from the fact that the League has been least effective when dealing with one of the big five.

He said he would again favor the League of Nations if and when it:

(1) Outlaws war.

(2) Democratizes itself by annuling the paramount powers now enjoyed by the Council.

(3) Takes steps to codify international law on the basis of the illegality of war and the jural equality of all nations.

(4) Gives affirmative jurisdiction to the world court, whereby the court can issue a summons to a defendant nation and hear and decide the matters in dispute, whether the offending nation likes it or not.

At this point Mr. Levinson thus characterized the roundabout efforts for peace:

Let us stop making faces at war. Let us stop trying to reduce the number of wars and the severity of wars. Let us look war straight in the face for what it is and realize that to compromise with it is to capitulate to it. Some people are for all so-called peace plans. You might as well be for none. Take prohibition for example. How can a man be for prohibition, high license and Sunday closing at one and the same time? That is the attitude that many, by analogy, take with war. What we want is not an armistice with war but its final extinction.

I inquired how Mr. Levinson would handle the question of international debts which is just now such a bother to the rehabilitation of the world. He said that under the present conditions cancellation by the United States of debts is simply a contribution by the United States to the war chests of the debtor nations, and that he is opposed to the United States paying the war bills of other nations whether of past wars or wars to come. Should the United States cancel the debts it should do so not because it is a wealthy creditor, not because nations are unable to pay, but as part of a move to secure world peace. The humanitarian way would be for the nations to get together and agree in lieu of their war debts to live in peace for a period of sixty-two years. In this case the United States could well afford to cancel the debts. The United States Supreme Court could be the judge as to whether the nations were keeping their agreement. In this way instead of sixty-two years of servitude the nations would have sixty-two years of peace. In other words, the United States could well afford to cancel the debts if by so doing we could secure the peace of the world. But Uncle Sam cannot afford to be the Santa Claus for the war offices of the world.

As a parting question I inquired how Mr. Levinson became so deeply interested in the fight against war. I knew that he had been unremitting in his devotion to the cause of peace, that he had spent vast amounts of time and energy in the efforts to educate the people on the question of Outlawry, and I wanted to know what started him on this road. He said that in 1917 he realized as he had never done before that the nations and the peoples of the world were in the grip of a monster system, which they did not like, which they feared and hated, but which they seemed utterly powerless to control. Upon further reflection he realized that this monster institution was strengthened by 80 per cent of the international laws then in existence, that it was enriched by the overwhelming percentage of the budgets of the nations of the earth, that it was glorified in the press and the pulpits and the text books of mankind. Hence he saw that the only possible effective opposition to this monster was not in regulation but in *the utter outlawry of the thing.* So simple seemed the plan of Outlawry that he at first hesitated to issue a statement on the subject. But upon reflection he remembered that all great issues are at bottom moral questions; and that in connection with war the problem was simply that of putting the law, where it should always be found, on the moral side of the issue. From this simple, clearcut analysis by a capable and sincere man came the most significant plan that has ever entered into the consideration of the issues of peace and war.

A long time ago another son of Israel said, "For all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword," and earlier still another said, "They shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruninghooks."

Reminiscences of Debs

After all the great of the earth had passed and passed again
while everybody saw and hurrahed
Then came the greatest of the earth and passed and passed
again unseen and unsaluted—
Will you always be blind? Will you always be deaf and
dumb?

—*Horace Traubel.*

I

How did I come to have such love and admiration for Eugene Debs? Well, that is a long story. It would involve almost my whole history. But perhaps these bits of information may elucidate the growth of my feeling.

To begin with I've been a wage slave ever since high school days, and have always been and still am one of the great army of insignificants striving against poverty to realize a few dreams. But through the years I think I've never lost my resentment against the unfairness of the capitalistic system, my sympathy for the underdog, my passion for justice, my hatred of war, nor my love for pioneers who try to blaze trails toward a saner civilization.

Horace Traubel, for 25 years Editor of his paper, *The Conservator,* was to me one of America's great pioneers, and for ten years I steeped my mind in his philosophy. It was Horace who introduced me to Gene in the lobby of the Hotel Broztell when he was on one of his speaking tours as Socialist Candidate for the Presidency. Horace and I were waiting with about 20 others for nearly an hour when Gene stepped out of the elevator and saw the crowd. Though he was in a hurry to catch a train he gathered in every one—every one but myself. I stood aloof too shy to approach so great a hero, for I had seen him cheered for a steady half hour the night before by more than 5,000 people. So I watched, meditating in my mind—that man's arms are endless, he takes them all to himself without question.

On the way out Horace asked him for a penny to buy a paper. Gene gave him a silver dollar. "My God," said Horace, "I don't need a dollar to buy a paper." And he put it in my slipper when Gene refused to take it back. Thus we walked him to his train. I did not see Gene again until after his imprisonment.

His imprisonment brought me close to Gene, for Horace said to me on one of his last days, "Write to Gene, he needs your love." So I wrote to Moundsville while Horace sat watching the ships on the East River. Came at once Gene's reply—of course he remembered the "Silver Dollar Girl," and he remembered her poems, he had been clipping them for many years and

sending them to one of his dearest friends. The whole letter was like, like—oh, so like Gene Debs. It breathed warmth and poesy and touched me to tears.

Thus began my prison correspondence with Gene. All of his replies from Atlanta, written on the backs of my own envelopes usually, were forwarded to me through one of his closest friends, for he was allowed but one letter a month—but evidently the prison said nothing about enclosures. To you who do not happen to possess such treasures I will tell you they are garlands of heart flowers that could have come only from a mighty glorious soul.

On Gene's first trip East after his incarceration he tried to find me many times, but always by some trick of fate I missed him. Whenever I heard he was coming to the city I would hound his hotel after working hours for he said he was determined to see me, but I never seemed to have the right luck. Three times he called at my home, once at seven o'clock in the morning. "Why," said I to the one who knew him so well, "should Gene want to see me?" "You are just the type," she answered, "a poet, a dreamer, loving the ideals for which he gives his life and Gene is a very lonely man and few really comprehend him." When so often I found he had come and gone my heart would be terrified lest he die before I fulfilled my longing to look close into his face and touch his hand.

At last came the long awaited hour in 1921. And now, to tell you the truth, I cannot recall the details of it, for when I first came into his presence I was so overcome with emotion that nothing but the theatre of his personality remains in my mind. The only similar experience I ever had was the night I went to see The Miracle as staged by Morris Gest and Max Reinhardt. I entered the cathedraled theatre a little late. As I groped to my seat I heard music coming it seemed from all over the house, the procession had already started down the great aisles. As it proceeded I found myself choked with an ecstasy almost too intense to endure. The color, the music, the movement of the vast pageant of humanity shook me to the foundation of my being, then left me in a state of calm exaltation. Meeting Gene for the first time was just like that and why not, for he was indeed a cathedral-hearted man in which the human pageant played out its tragic part. To all types, all classes, he reverently gave entrance and everyone who entered his holy heart could not help but feel the miracle of love he wrought.

When he returned to Terre Haute I sent him this poem:

"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house,"
Yet I do, thy house, the house of thy heart—
A house that through the years has torn away all doors,
Keyless, lockless, boltless, without bells for secret entry
Without lackeys to usher in the chosen few;
Wide corridored, nookful, comfortable, lighted divinely,
No antique fence surrounding, no mote, no drawbridge,
No gaudy gated paths for the purchased elect;
No stiffly laid out gardens, no artificial fountains,
Untaxed, unmortgaged, neither to be sold nor bought,
Yet a mighty mansion with turrets touching heaven,
Denying no one hospitality, a right royal rendezvous,
Indestructible, an enduring modern home,
Built on America's road within the cry and call of her children!
"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house,"
Yet I do, thy house, the house of thy heart.

But the memory of the second time I saw Gene is cut in my mind like an exquisite cameo. He was slouched on a couch waiting for me at his hotel, his hat drawn over his eyes. He looked weary and a little old. I recall touching his shoulder and seeing him rise in a sort of graceful glory and smile his inimitable smile. When the door to his room was closed and I was with him alone I looked way up into his face for he seemed to tower above my little figure. Then he put both hands on my shoulders and looked into my face long and long. I could not seem to stand it, somehow he radiated something too beautiful, so I threw my arms about his neck and laughed with joy to be with him and wept with grief remembering his persecution. "You Gene above all men," I said, "seem to understand the true meaning of love." Then he put me in a big comfy chair and pulled a little one for himself right in front of me.

As he talked I grew more and more surprised at the things he said. I had thought to find him too spirituelle, too idealistic in his view point, but he did not so impress me. I was astonished at his very human qualities, the virility of his mind and the soundness of his thought. In the hour we discussed modern art, poetry, psycho-analysis, Clarence Darrow, evolution, his brother Theodore, John Haynes Holmes, the function of the church, the efficacy of suffering for the development of the soul, how poverty enlarges the heart and a great deal about Horace Traubel. I recollect he said of Horace: "He yet will come into his own as did Walt Whitman, not now but in another hundred years or so, not as a follower of Walt but as a unique literary genius, a great poet and philosopher and a spiritual force unsurpassed in America. Rosalie he said I don't belong to the literati, but certain things I KNOW."

Then he moved forward and took both my hands in his. "You have a rare intuition and understanding, Rosalie, I want to talk to you about those I love the most." It was at that moment as if by a force divine his face lost all signs of age. I leaned back in my chair watching, listening, oh, so closely. There was indeed a transfiguration. He became for the nonce a man of forty in the fullest vigor of his manhood, brilliant, superb. Through it all I could hear myself asking—Can it be that this is Gene Debs, a man of seventy odd years, so stalwart, so powerful? Does something supernatural burn in his frame, or is it a concentrated love force that holds me spell bound.

The sixty minutes over he took me to the elevator. In the lobby we sat down again. Kate O'Hare came to say a sculptor was waiting to do his head. "I don't want my head done," he laughed to me. "I want to talk to you." He took me to the hotel door, then into the street. "Let's go and get some coffee," he said. But I began to feel terribly guilty, his rooms were crowded with people. "Gene," I said, "you belong to those who wait." But he would not hear. Over and over again he poured words of immortal beauty into my ears. I shall never forget it, Gene leaning against a wall on the corner of Broadway and 28th Street holding a red rose I'd brought him and I weeping like a child who has at last found an understanding father. At last I said, "Gene, you must go," I ran across the street. At the curb I turned. He was waving the red rose. Again and again I looked back through the crowd. Still he stood there waving to me until I was out of sight. When he returned to T. H. one of his dearest friends wrote me that Gene wanted to adopt me. "Well," I answered, "if he adopted all those he loved he would have *some* family."

From my window at the *World* office in the days

when he was dying I looked upon the city cloaked in a gray mist. I heard the tooting of the ships in the fog. I kept saying to myself "Who now will be a beacon in the dark for such as I?" Then I would go into the press room for news of him. "The machine age is on our backs," I kept thinking, "and Gene Debs is dying. Who now will bear the torch of justice for the American worker? Who?" For to those who believe in masterhood and servanthood he was a challenge to their narrow hearts and to those who felt their egos crushed, their expression frustrated by the bonds of a too meagre livelihood he was a star of hope and solace.

Strange it seems as I write. I ought to know it because they tell me it is so, but somehow I can't believe America holds the ashes of our Beloved Gene. I think he is still standing somewhere on an American street waving the red rose of comradeship to an insignificant lost in the common crowd.

New York City. ROSALIE GOODYEAR.

Words

Have you delivered yourself into the hands of the phrasemaker?

What do words mean to you? Do words come to you as unexplored territory into which you project your mind to discover every possible shade of meaning? Or have the phrasemakers so brought you to heel that one meaning exhausts all the possibilities of which your imagination is capable?

Consider the phrasemaker, like a colossal octopus he reaches up through the primeval slime of man's ignorance, spreading his tentacles to the fartherest corners of the earth, seeking to make man forget his brain through the mental inertia of those of us who refuse to think.

Have you delivered yourself into the hands of the phrasemaker? Are you willing to go out and do battle for the integrity of words? All language is full of great, expressive words. Are you willing to limit their power of reaching the hearts and minds of men?

Surely the greatest words are those whose meanings are infinite. Those words that become malleable in the hands of poets and philosophers and carry us into undreamed of countries of the soul. Like the limitless variations that the artist achieves from a few basic colors, like the great structures of mathematics from a few accepted premises, like the wonderful harmonies of a symphony created from a few simple tones. So are words, so much closer to the daily life of men, capable of countless variations in the hands of a master.

Have you delivered yourself into the hands of the phrasemaker? Are you leaving to others all the joy and inspiration that comes from an understanding of the majesty of words? Do you accept the words you are given, without protest and without curiosity? Do you take them at their face value merely; to be spoken once for a single purpose and then discarded? Are you content to see spread before you all the marvelous power of the written and spoken word, and to pass them by?

Where is there an experience that touches the soul of man that cannot be enriched by the use of the right word? Where is there a beauty that cannot be intensified by the use of the right word? Where is there a joy that cannot be shared by the use of the right word? Where is there an aspiration that cannot be conveyed by the use of the right word?

Have you delivered yourself into the hands of the phrasemaker? The phrasemaker is a murderer of words. Do you know that dead thing he displayed for your approval? That was once a word, glowing and full of color. It was capable of wonderful things, its possibilities were untried, it was young and full of vigor. Now it is dead. Most of us can never touch it again. Only the hand of a master can bring it back to life. What the phrasemaker kills becomes anathema. The words he ruins become tools for the parrot and the pharisee, but the heart of man knows them no more. He was a liar from the beginning and his touch is death.

Oh, the splendid heritage of words! Wonderful, primitive words from the past, brilliantly glowing words of the present, miraculous, splendid words of the future. Let every word re-live itself a thousand times in your consciousness. Let every word color itself into a thousand hues. Let every word construct vast temples of understanding. Let every word bring joy into the souls of men. Let every word give aspiration the voice of limitless scope. Through words the mind of man reaches all thought. Through words the heart of man reaches all love. Through words the soul of man reaches infinity.

Where is the man who knows the heart and soul of words? Are you that man; or have you delivered yourself into the hands of the phrasemaker?

For UNITY. GERTRUDE TRAUBEL.

Correspondence

Washington and the Peace Party

Editor of UNITY:

The question is raised by a professor in one of our universities whether it is right or fitting for peace people as such to celebrate the birthdays of Washington and Lincoln, since both were leaders in our great wars. Few sane persons, with a knowledge of history, question the sad necessity of some wars for defense, freedom or the supremacy of law in the past, before a World Court, a World League, international arbitration or any legal machinery for the settlement of international disputes had entered into practical politics. The first proposal indeed for international arbitration was by Samuel Adams, "the father of the American Revolution," in a memorial framed by him for the Massachusetts legislature to the national Congress while we were still living under the articles of Confederation. Our war for independence was not strictly an international war, but a civil war, between the liberal and reactionary parties in both England and America, with Chatham, Burke and Fox fighting our battle in Parliament, as Washington and Jefferson were fighting it here. No arguments can be drawn from that situation which affects the international situation in 1926.

So far as peace and war as political methods are concerned, Washington, Jefferson and Franklin were emphatically on the peace side; they were the preeminent peace statesmen of their day. Washington wrote in 1785: "My first wish is to see war, the plague of mankind, banished from the earth, and the sons and daughters of this world employed more innocently than in preparing implements and exercising them for the destruction of mankind." In 1788 he wrote to Marquis de Chastullux: "It is the time

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

AN OPEN LETTER

[Addressed by the United Roumanian Jews of America to Mr. George Cretziano, Roumania Minister at Washington, D. C.]

UNITED ROUMANIAN JEWS OF AMERICA
799 Broadway, New York
Telephone . . Worth 6844
Leo Wolfson, President.
Herman Speier, Exec. Secretary.

To His Excellency, George Cretziano,
Minister of Roumania,
Washington, D. C.

Excellency:

We respectfully bring to your attention the following:

Alarming and shocking news, with reference to the treatment of the Jews in Roumania, have reached us during the last few weeks.

We had hoped that the present government would keep its pledges to maintain order and to protect the life and property of its Jewish citizens. We must note, however, with sorrow in our hearts, that not only has it failed to do so, but it has actually pursued a policy, which is directly responsible for the tragic and deplorable events, which have recently taken place.

In Cernauti, a Jewish student, David Falik, was in a cowardly and brutal manner murdered in a hall of justice, while on trial for a misdemeanor before a Roumanian Tribunal. The murderer was a Roumanian University student, who came specially from Iasi to commit the crime. It was as cold, deliberate and premeditated a murder as was ever committed. The conscience of the country should have been shocked and aroused at this atrocious crime. The government should have taken the sternest measures to punish the assassin and those who instigated him. Instead, the murderer is being proclaimed a national hero, a super patriot, and is petted and adulated. He, too, will no doubt be freed as was the murderer of the Police officer Manciu. What opinion can the civilized world have of such stultification, mockery and travesty of justice?

The state of affairs which led to the murder must also be laid at the door of the government. Its policy towards Jewish students who sought admission to the University is indefensible. The examinations were unfair and deliberately framed with a view to "flunk" the Jewish students. As was intended, over seventy-five per cent of those who took the examinations failed. When the students and their parents protested against the introduction of this indirect way, of the infamous "numerus clausus" they were arrested, tried and punished. In this case Roumanian justice was swift. So many guilty offenders against the peace and order of the country remain untried and unpunished. Defenders of their rights, fighters against oppression and persecution, they were quickly made to feel the penalty of the laws. The actions of the government with reference to the examinations and the subsequent events are and constitute a flagrant violation of the rights of the Jews as Roumanian citizens, as guaranteed to them by the treaties of Versailles and St. Germain. Roumania ill repays her Jews the many sacrifices of blood and fortune, which they have brought upon the altar of their country.

---

for the age of knight errantry and mad heroism to be at an end. It is devoutly to be wished that the manly employment of agriculture and the humanizing benefits of commerce supersede the waste of war and the rage of conquest." To Lafayette he wrote: "It is a strange thing that there should not be room enough in this world for men to live without cutting each other's throats." Franklin was even more pronounced on the subject. "In my opinion," he said repeatedly, "there never was a good war nor a bad peace." Twenty pages of Franklin's peace utterances have been gathered into an Old South leaflet; and its counterpart can not be found among the utterances of contemporaneous European statesmen.

Of all the great leaders of the Revolution, Jefferson was the preeminent international man. It would be an act of supererogation to quote peace passages from him. Henry Adams, in his history, sums it up truthfully when he says: "Jefferson aspired beyond the ambition of a nationality and embraced in his view the whole future of man. That the United States should become a nation like France, England, or Russia, or conquer the world like Rome, was no part of his scheme. He wished to begin a new era, hoping for a time when the world's ruling interests should be universal, when questions of boundaries and nationality should become insignificant, and armies and navies should be reduced to the work of police."

The whole question is one of evolution. Emerson put the matter in a nutshell when he said that war belongs to the juvenile period in human development. It is as with absolutism, polytheism, polygamy, slavery, witchcraft, the burning of heretics, and the limiting of suffrage and education to males. We have now come, it is to be hoped, to the maturity whose business it is to put an end to the childish folly and wickedness of war and substitute legal and rational procedure, to help organize the family of nations as Washington and Franklin organized this family of states.

The question of "human nature," which troubles our writer and other good folks, did not trouble Washington and Franklin. It will trouble us less and less. There is nothing in the world which has changed so much in the last 5,000 years, or the last 1,000, or which is changing so fast today, as human nature. The founders of the Republic did not wait for any change in "human nature." In every period human nature is equal to the duties and responsibilities of the period. The founders utilized human nature as it was, and turned it to rational ends. It is for us to do the same.

EDWIN D. MEAD.

Boston, Mass.

Mussolini and the Carnegie Endowment

Editor of UNITY:

Among the recent pamphlets of the American Association for International Conciliation, there is one which raises serious misgivings—"The Political Doctrine of Fascism" by Alfredo Rocco, Mussolini's Minister of Justice. The editors are fair enough to include a bibliography in which opponents of Fascism are also listed. But in the foreword by President Nicholas Murray Butler, we are assured that Fascism is a "silent and bloodless revolution" aiming at "ideals which, taken together, constitute a new aspect of political philosophy."

It is greatly to be hoped that Dr. Butler's words will not be taken to imply approval of the regime whose conduct in the past four years can scarcely be called conciliatory or pacific. In the pamphlet, "The Fascist Dictatorship," published by the International Committee for Political Prisoners, Prof. Salvemini and others offer testimony which would seem to indicate something very different from what Dr. Butler calls "a silent and bloodless revolution."

Moreover, it is hard to see what can be counted new (using the word either in the literal sense or as a term of praise) in Rocco's defense of Fascism. Granted that Liberalism tends to become atomistic: what is new in dictatorship as a solution of the problem? Note only the terms in which Rocco lauds Macchiavelli: "Fascism learns from him not only its doctrines but its actions as well." "He is not only the greatest of modern political writers, he is also the greatest of our countrymen in full possession of a national Italian consciousness. To liberate Italy . . . and to make her more powerful, he would use any means, for to his mind the holiness of the end justifies them completely." To call all this or any of the corollaries which Mussolini is applying with the Big Stick "a new political philosophy," seems far from the principles of that new world-order to which the Conciliation Association is pledged.

There are too many Americans today whose condemnation of Russian violence is matched only by their approval of Italian violence in the interests of conservatism. It would be most deplorable if Dr. Butler's foreword were to give the impression that the officers of the Carnegie Endowment also accept this double ethical standard. Would it not be just for the publishers of Rocco's article now to print either that of Salvemini or of some other advocate for the other side?

HENRY NEUMANN.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

Then, the Congress of the Roumanian University students took place. Disregarding the poisonous propaganda it spread, the many falsehoods and vile calumnies it uttered, from previous experiences, the government should have know that it usually ends with manifestations against the Jews. Measures should have been taken to protect the Jews—a pitiable enough situation. The government, however, did nothing. The results have added a black page to Roumanian history and another heart-rending chapter to the history of the Jews.

Pogroms took place in Kishineff and Calarasi, and manifestations and devastations in other cities. Bands of Roumanian students perpetrated these atrocities, and the authorities stopped them only after their destructive work was done. Once more Jewish blood was spilled on the pavements of the streets of Kishineff. Once more, under the present regime, Jewish men, women and children, were beaten and maltreated. Jewish stores were looted and robbed. Jewish houses were damaged, window panes smashed. Even synagogues were not spared by the vandals. Trains are being stopped and Jewish passengers, after being beaten and robbed, are actually thrown off them.

Pogroms—mob attacks against the Jews, instigated by or made with the connivance or approval of the government, used to be a Russian institution in the dark days of czardom rule. Now we have a pogrom—yes, a pogrom in the real Russian style, perpetrated by Roumanian hoodlums under a Roumanian regime. We say, deliberately, that the Kishineff pogrom of 1926 and the excesses which were instigated by the so-called students could not have taken place if the government had done its simple duty. To its everlasting shame it had not done it, and history will hold it responsible for this crime against the Jews.

We, as American citizens born in Roumania, who have always taken a deep interest in Roumania and her welfare, feel ashamed that such cruel, tragic events could take place there. Our heart goes out in sympathy to our poor, unfortunate brethren in Roumania. We believe it to be our solemn duty to give expression to our indignation and protest against the pogroms, outrages, and devastations of which our brethren are the victims. We condemn publicly the government of Roumania and charge it with being directly responsible for the crimes committed against the Jews.

We call upon all men and women of America and the civilized world, who love freedom, justice and fair play to give expression of their own righteous indignation and protest against the Government of Roumania.

These, Your Excellency, are the facts about the situation of the Jews in Roumania, and not the official version which you kindly conveyed to us.

Yours respectfully,
LEO WOLFSON,
President.

HERMAN SPEIER,
Exec. Secretary.

The World-Man

Make room for the World-man!
Prepare ye the way!
And hasten the coming
Of Love's Triumph-day.

Make room for the World-man!
No power can withhold
The dream of the ages
By prophets foretold.

O hearts of the millions,
List, list for the Voice!
The deserts shall blossom,
The nations rejoice.

O hearts of the nations,
List, list to the call,
And welcome the World-man,
Great brother of all.

Where, where shall we seek him?
My vision is true!
O hearts of the millions,
He liveth in You!

—*Henry Victor Morgan.*

FEBRUARY

Attentions to your wardrobe and home should include the cleansing and sanitation of garments and furnishings now showing the effects of Winter's soot and grime. Only by our new continuous flow process are the finest results obtained.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 6261 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

3913 Cottage Grove
Tel. Atlantic 1876

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. and Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Do This for their sake!

GIVE your children Bowman's Milk. It furnishes quick energy to offset fatigue. It builds fine teeth and strong bones. A quart a day is none too much, so doctors say.

BOWMAN DAIRY COMPANY MILK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.